

REMARKS

1. Introduction

In the Office Action mailed August 8, 2005, the Examiner rejected claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Zimmerman, U.S. Patent No. 6,745,040 ("Zimmerman").

In response, Applicants have amended claims 1 and 9.

For the reasons set forth below, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the claims, as amended herein.

2. Response to Rejections

a. Claims 1-8

Of these claims, claim 1 is independent. The Examiner has rejected claim 1 under § 102 as being anticipated by Zimmerman. In response, Applicants have amended claim 1 to specify that the first message, which includes the identifier code, is transmitted to the mobile station "over an air interface." This amendment is supported by the present application in various places, for example, at page 5, lines 4-10 and at page 8, lines 11-15. Applicants submit that this amendment clearly distinguishes over Zimmerman, as set forth below.

Claim 1 is directed to a method of managing a plurality of directory numbers for a mobile station, including at least a first directory number and a second directory number. The first directory number is associated with an identifier code that is recognized by the mobile station. For example, the mobile station might provide a user-discernible indication based on the identifier code, as recited in claim 4. When an incoming call to the first directory number is detected, claim 1 specifies a procedure to determine which identifier code is associated with the called number and to provide the identifier code to the mobile station. In particular, claim 1

recites that a call control system is queried with the first directory number, and a response that includes the identifier code is received. A first message that includes the identifier code is then transmitted to the mobile station. Moreover, claim 1 has been amended to specify that this first message -- and, thus, the identifier code included in the first message -- is transmitted over an air interface. Thus, claim 1 recites a method in which the identifier code associated with the called number is obtained in a process that is *external* to the mobile station and is then provided to the mobile station via a transmission over an air interface.

In contrast, Zimmerman discloses an *internal* process. Zimmerman discloses “personas” that are associated with directory numbers and dispositions, e.g., as shown in Figure 4A of Zimmerman. In the Examiner’s rationale, a “persona” corresponds to the “identifier code” recited in claim 1. Assuming that this correspondence is valid, it is clear that the “personas” in Zimmerman are stored and used internally within the mobile station. For example, Figure 4A, which shows the associations between “personas,” directory numbers, and dispositions, represents data that is stored in memory 312 of the cellular telephone 120. This information stored in memory 312 is used by a processor 304 that is also within the cellular telephone 120. When one of the directory numbers is called, processor 304 accesses memory 312 to determine which “persona” is being accessed and the appropriate disposition. *See, e.g.*, col. 4, lines 42-46, col. 5, lines 6-12 and col. 5, lines 35-50. Thus, Zimmerman discloses a process that is *internal* to the cellular telephone for determining which “persona” and disposition applies, based on which directory number is called. Zimmerman does not disclose the transmission of “personas” or “identifier codes” over an air interface, because the associations between “personas,” directory numbers, and dispositions are already stored within the cellular telephone.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 1, as amended, is allowable over Zimmerman for at least the foregoing reasons. Applicants further submit that claims 2-8 are allowable for at least the reason that they are dependent on an allowable claim.

b. Claims 9-13

Of these claims, claim 9 is independent. The Examiner has rejected claim 9 under § 102 as being anticipated by Zimmerman. In response, Applicants have amended claim 9 to specify that the call control system stores an association between the first directory number and an identifier code “externally to said mobile station.” This amendment is supported by the present application in various places, for example, the sentence bridging pages 6 and 7, stating that an HLR or SCP “may store associations between directory numbers and identifiers for mobile stations.” Applicants submit that amendment clearly distinguishes over Zimmerman.

In particular, as noted above for claim 1, Zimmerman discloses that the associations between “personas,” directory numbers, and dispositions are stored in a memory *within* the cellular telephone. Thus, Zimmerman does not disclose “storing, *externally* to said mobile station, an association between said first directory number and an identifier code recognized by said mobile station,” as recited in amended claim 9.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 9, as amended, is allowable over Zimmerman for at least the foregoing reasons. Applicants further submit that claims 10-13 are allowable for at least the reason that they are dependent on an allowable claim.

c. Claims 14-18

Of these claims, claim 14 is independent. The Examiner has rejected claim 14 under § 102 as being anticipated by Zimmerman. In response, Applicants submit that this rejection is

clearly improper, and should be withdrawn, because the Examiner has not shown that each and every element of claim 14 is disclosed in Zimmerman.

In particular, claim 14 recites, *inter alia*, “detecting a request to *originate* a call from said mobile station to a called party, said request including said identifier code.” The Examiner has alleged that this step is disclosed in Zimmerman, at col. 2, lines 1-10 and 23-35. However, these sections of Zimmerman do not refer to *originating* calls from a mobile station but, rather, refer to *receiving* calls:

In accordance with the method, the communication unit, upon *receiving a call*, automatically identifies the persona that is being accessed and automatically responds in accordance with a pre-stored disposition instruction.

(col. 2, lines 6-10)(emphasis added); and:

At an operational stage, upon *receiving an incoming call*, the particular directory number that is dialed by the caller is automatically identified.

(col. 2, lines 23-25). Zimmerman does not disclose a request to originate a call from a mobile station, wherein the request includes an identifier code, as recited in claim 14.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 14 is allowable over Zimmerman for at least the foregoing reasons. Applicants further submit that claims 15-18 are allowable for at least the reason that they are dependent on an allowable claim.


3. **Conclusion**

Applicants submit that the present application is in condition for allowance, and notice to that effect is hereby requested. Should the Examiner feel that further dialog would advance the subject application to issuance, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at any time at (312) 913-0001.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 30, 2005

By:



Richard A. Machonkin

Reg. No. 41,962